Remarks/Arguments

Claim 1 has been amended consistent with the recent interview with the Examiner. Claims 11, 36 and 37 are amended herein to address minor typographical errors. The amendments do not introduce new matter.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph

Claims 1-13, 18-24, and 36-45 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as non-enabled. The Examiner's concern appears to whether a protein, expressed in a transgenic plant, would be able to confer protease resistance (to a protease) to a protein, when the protein is applied to the outside of the plant. These rejections are respectfully traversed if applied to the amended claims.

Applicants first wish to thank the Examiner for the helpful interview held in connection with this Office Action. The Examiner agreed that Applicants could overcome this rejection by amending Claim 1 to specify that when the peptide with protease inhibitory activity is applied to a plant, the protection is provided against proteases external to the plant. The Examiner also agreed (in principal) that Applicants could also amend Claim 1 to specify that when the peptide with protease inhibitory activity is produced by a plant, the protection against proteases is intracellular to the plant unless accompanied by a secretion signal peptide. The Examiner also agreed to consider that Applicants could amend Claim 1 to state that, when the peptide with protease inhibitory activity and the protein to be protected from protease degradation and/or inactivation are expressed in the same intracellular space, the protection against proteases is provided in the intracellular space.

Applicants have amended Claim 1 as discussed with the Examiner. It is believed that the amendment addresses all of the issues raised by the Examiner. The claims discuss the manner in which a peptide with protease inhibitory activity provides protection against proteases. When applied to a plant, it can provide protease inhibitory activity external to (but not internal to) the plant. When produced by a plant, it can provide intracellular protection against proteases, and can provide extracellular protection when accompanied by a secretion signal peptide (in which the peptide can be secreted by the plant). When the peptide with protease inhibitory activity and

the protein to be protected from protease degradation and/or inactivation are expressed in the same intracellular space, the protection against proteases is provided in the intracellular space.

Conclusion

The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding enablement rejections in light of the amendments to the claims and the comments presented above. It is believed that the Application is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned to facilitate prosecution if any outstanding issues remain.

Respectfully submitted,

David S. Bradin
Reg. No. 37,783
Attorney for Applicant

Date: March 4, 2004
Telephone: (919) 484-2382
Docket: V46275 1520.1

Womble Carlyle Sandridge & Rice, PLLC
P.O. Box 7037
Atlanta, Georgia 30357-0037